

### **REMARKS**

Claims 11-23 have been withdrawn. Claims 1-10 remain in the application under examination. Applicant asserts that no new matter has been added. Reconsideration of the Application is hereby requested.

### **Claim Rejections**

#### ***Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102***

Claims 1, 5, 6 and 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e), as being anticipated by Virgin et al. (US 6,826,542).

Applicant submits herewith the Affidavit of Leonard J. Fabiano, III, pursuant to 37 C.F.R. 1.131, swearing behind the Virgin reference. As can be seen by the Fabiano Affidavit, Mr. Fabiano invented the claimed invention by no later than November 22, 1999. As will be shown below, the present inventor's date of invention antedates the earliest date upon which Virgin et al. claims priority.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection on the grounds that Virgin et al. does not qualify as a reference under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e). The earliest date upon which Virgin et al. claims priority is November 23, 1999 (claiming priority on Provisional Application No. 60/167,103).

Under 35 U.S.C. §102(e), the invention must be described in either:

- (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or
- (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, .... [35 U.S.C. §102(e)]

Virgin et al. does not qualify under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) because its earliest possible filing date was November 23, 1999, whereas the present application (as evidenced by the Fabiano Affidavit) has a date of invention of no later than November 22, 1999. Therefore, Virgin cannot qualify as a 102(e) reference (or as a reference under any other paragraph in section 102).

Because Virgin et al. does not qualify as a §102(e) reference, Applicant asserts that this rejection has been overcome and respectfully requests that it be withdrawn.

***Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103***

Claims 2-4 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being unpatentable over Virgin et al. (US 6,826,542).

Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection on the grounds that Virgin et al. does not qualify as a reference under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (as discussed above with reference to the §102 rejection) and, therefore, can not be used to support a §103 rejection. Therefore, Applicant requests that this rejection be withdrawn.

Applicant also asserts that Virgin does not claim the same invention as claimed in the claims under examination in the present application.

**Prior Art Made of Record**

In addition to the remarks presented above, Applicant asserts that the remaining prior art made of record neither anticipates, nor renders obvious the claimed invention.

**CONCLUSION**

Applicant believes that the rejections have been overcome for the reasons recited above.

Application No. 09/674,221  
Amendment dated 05/13/2008  
Reply to Office Action dated 12/13/2007  
Page 11 of 11


Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that all remaining claims be allowed and that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued.

**REQUEST FOR TWO MONTH EXTENSION OF TIME**

Applicant hereby requests a two month extension of time. Payment for the extension will be made during electronic filing.

No addition fees are believed due. However, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees that may be required, including any necessary extensions of time, which are hereby requested, to Deposit Account No. 503535.

05/13/2008  
Date

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Bryan W. Bockhop  
Registration No. 39,613

**Customer Number: 25854**

Bockhop & Associates, LLC  
2375 Mossy Branch Dr.  
Snellville, GA 30078

Tel. 678-919-1075  
Fax 678-609-1483  
E-Mail: [bwb@bockpatent.com](mailto:bwb@bockpatent.com)